



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/647,126	11/20/2000	Paul Thomas	60,130-884	4027	
26096	7590 07/02/2002				
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.			EXAMINER		
SUITE 350	IAPLE ROAD		SICONOLFI, ROBERT		
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3683		
				DATE MAILED: 07/02/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	•	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/647,126	THOMAS ET AL.
7. 29	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert A Siconolfi	3683
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 27 June 2002 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a hplaces the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amough the shortened statutory period for reply se later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·
10. Other:		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that it is not obvious to combine Baumgartner and Angerfors. These arguments have been replied to previously in paper no. 11. Applicant further argues that the referenc does not disclose a smooth sealing surface for engagment by another seal. The examiner disagrees. There is clearly a smooth surface that is able to be engaged by a seal. Claims 20,21,27, and 28 are written in functional form and thereby the reference is only required to be capable of use in that manner.

ACK LAVINDER

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

JECHNOLOGY CLAYEN OOK